



## A Comment on "Applying Management Reserve to Software Project Management"

First I think *CrossTalk* is great! I just wish I would take more time to read it consistently. Keep up the great work.

Comments in reference to an article written by Walter H. Lipke in *CrossTalk* March 1999: My experience with software projects in trouble with schedule is that adjusting overtime or adding more employees or realigning employees to supposedly increase efficiency has never fixed any software schedule slip-page. These were the options recommended by the author. My experience has been that the project just slips to the right further when these options are exercised. Reducing performance requirements and/or negotiating additional schedule is the best way to give the project a chance to be completed to the new schedule or requirements. The other options, in my opinion, only perpetuate a culture that needs serious improvement.

Paul Genskow  
Defense Logistics Agency

## The Facts about SEI's CMM-Based Appraisal for Internal Process Improvement

We would like to provide some additional information relative to "The Journey to CMM Level 5: A Time Line," an article written by Pat Cosgriff in *CrossTalk* May 1999.

The Software Engineering Institute (SEI) does not have an appraisal or assessment called a "Delta Appraisal." The SEI's CMM®-Based Appraisal for Internal Process Improvement (CBA IPI) represents an investigation at a single point in time of (1) projects defined to be within the assessment's organizational scope, and (2) key process areas (KPAs) within the assessment's CMM scope.

After sufficient data is collected during an assessment, rating may proceed for each goal within each KPA. For a KPA to be satisfied, all of its goals must be satisfied. For all KPAs within the assessment scope, the entire KPA — including all of its goals — must be investigated.

If a maturity level is desired by the assessment sponsor, all of the KPAs of a particular maturity level must be investigated, as well as all of the KPAs in lower maturity levels. For example, if an organization desires to achieve a maturity Level 3, all of the maturity Level 2 and maturity Level 3 KPAs must be inves-

tigated by collecting data for each key practice of each KPA.

Partial assessments (e.g., where some but not all goals of a KPA were rated) may be valuable as an interim activity for organizations to monitor their process improvement progress; however, such an assessment would not be considered to meet the minimum requirements of a CBA IPI.

Feedback from the community has strongly advised against partial assessments due to the opportunities for confusion or misuse. A CBA IPI must be a full assessment, examining all of the key process areas within the assessment scope, including each of the goals of each KPA, during the on-site period. It is recommended that the on-site period be completed within at most a four-week period. A CBA IPI on-site period is typically completed within a five-to-10-day period of time.

In March 1995, at the time of the Ogden assessment referenced in the above article, the CBA IPI method was in prototype stage using CBA IPI v0.3 materials. As a result of field exercises and community feedback, the method was significantly revised. CBA IPI v1.0 was released in May 1995, and CBA IPI v1.1 was released in March 1996. Although partial assessments were used experimentally in CBA IPI v0.3, there is no provision for a partial assessment to be a tailoring option in CBA IPI v1.0 or v1.1.

In the March 1995 assessment at Ogden, the team reviewed in detail the practices that they had investigated in great depth a few months earlier to determine that they were still in place. Consequently, the assessment team felt that they had done a thorough job and the results were valid.

The issue that was raised most frequently was: have they been doing these new or updated processes for sufficiently long that we could consider them to be institutionalized? There were debates during the assessment, and the team came to consensus as the results indicated.

However, in order to avoid any compromise to the integrity of an assessment, it is recommended that additional days of work be undertaken to perform a full CBA IPI.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide additional information on the subject of partial assessments.

Donna K. Dunaway, Ph.D.  
Team Leader, CMM-Based Appraisal for  
Internal Process Improvement (CBA IPI)

*The Capability Maturity Model and CMM are registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.*

**Correction:** On page 29 of my July 1999 article, "Confusing Process and Product: Why the Quality is not There Yet," the reference to Alan Davis in the first paragraph, last sentence should read "Alan Davis, in his excellent book 201 Principles of Software Development, says that good management motivates people to do their best. Poor management demotivates people [11]."

The sentence was quite incorrect, and stated the exact opposite of what Dr. Davis said. I regret the error, and apologize to Alan Davis. I just wish there was some way I could blame this on the Y2K problem.

— David Cook